

BRAC 2005 Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG)**Meeting Minutes of February 20, 2004**

The Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), Mr. Michael W. Wynne chaired this meeting. The list of attendees is attached.

Mr. Wynne opened the meeting and asked Mr. Peter Potochney, the Director of the OSD BRAC Office, to briefly update the BRAC process to date. Mr. Potochney then briefly noted the military value briefings given to date and the presentations remaining.

Vice Admiral Holder, the chair of the Supply and Storage JCSG (S&S JCSG), then briefed the JCSG's approach to military value using the attached slides. Vice Admiral Holder emphasized that the group was focused on making the BRAC process successful by assessing military value from a joint perspective. He then proceeded to describe the group's overall emphasis on driving towards efficiency and effectiveness built on a modern information technology infrastructure, a well trained and flexible workforce, and substantial multi-modal shipping (i.e. air, rail, and ship) capability. He stated the challenge was determining how to align the capabilities and military value of the assets that support these goals. He again emphasized that the overarching approach of the S&S JCSG to military value was to use the collective experience of the JCSG principals to make the best decision for the Department as a whole. Vice Admiral Holder stated that the proper place for service specific needs to be factored into the analysis was through policy imperatives.

Vice Admiral Holder then proceeded to describe the details of the JCSG's military value approach. He noted that the JCSG had developed a process for organizing the commodities managed in the supply system to factor in the spectrum of the commodities' complexity. For example, managing the supply and storage and distribution of water is significantly less complex than managing the supply of nuclear sub safe equipment. The ISG members asked questions about the S&S JCSG's approach to organizing the commodities based on their complexity. As a result of the discussion, Vice Admiral Holder agreed with the ISG's recommendation to ensure that the approach to complexity is explained in terms that outsiders such as the BRAC commissioners can readily understand.

The ISG and Vice Admiral Holder next discussed the S&S JCSGs assignment of weights to the criteria. Some ISG members noted that the weights assigned by the JCSG to the criteria varied significantly. The Chair stated that he believed that varied weights were a sign that the JCSGs were exercising their independent military judgment appropriately. The ISG also discussed whether the capacity of the private sector should be evaluated as part of the S&S JCSGs approach. The ISG and Vice Admiral Holder agreed that the capabilities of the private sector were best considered as part of scenario development.

The ISG and the S&S JCSG next discussed the overall criteria and attributes that the S&S JCSG planned to use as part of the military value analysis. The ISG members asked Vice Admiral Holder questions about who he thought would respond to the data call questions. The ISG and members of the OSD BRAC and Service BRAC staffs discussed the issue of how the second data call would proceed. Overall, they agreed that the JCSGs and the Services will work together to determine where the questions would go, noting that the intent for military value questions was to target the questions as much as possible to those facilities that had been identified through the capacity data call as performing functions related to the JCSG. For example, facilities identified as warehouses would answer S&S JCSG questions but not questions on test and evaluation equipment asked by the Technical JCSG.

After reviewing examples of the weighting and scoring approach, Vice Admiral Holder touched on how the S&S JCSG “war gamed” the questions to ensure that they could be understood by the field and that they reflected the logic of the military value approach. The briefing concluded with a discussion of outstanding issues. Vice Admiral Holder noted that the JCSG was trying to determine the best way to appropriately score activities with multi modal shipping capability (e.g. a facility that has both a railhead and a port) or those that involve transiting supplies through commercial ports.

The ISG Chair closed the meeting by thanking the S&S JCSG for its approach and excellent effort.

Approved: _____


Michael W. Wynne
Acting USD(Acquisition Technology and Logistics)
Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group

Attachments:

1. List of Attendees
2. Briefing slides entitled “BRAC 2005 Issues” dated February 20, 2004
3. Briefing slides entitled “Supply and Storage JCSG Approach to Assessing Military Value” February 20, 2004

Infrastructure Steering Group Meeting February 20, 2004

Attendees

Members:

- Mr. Michael W. Wynne Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics)
- Mr. Raymond DuBois, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (I&E)
- Hon. H.T. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (I&E)
- Mr. Geoffrey Prosch, for Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (I&E)
- Admiral William Mullen, Vice Chief of Naval Operations
- Hon. Nelson Gibbs, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (IE&L)
- General George Casey, Vice Chief of Staff, Army
- General William Nyland, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps

Alternates:

- Lieutenant General James Cartwright, Director, Force Structure, Resources and Assessment, Joint Staff for General Peter Pace, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
- Major General Gary W. Heckman, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force for Plans and Programs for General Michael Moseley, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force

Supply and Storage

- Vice Admiral Gordon Holder Director, Logistics (J4), Joint Staff
- Vice Admiral Keith W. Lippert Director, Defense Logistics Agency
- Rear Admiral Alan Thompson Director, Supply, Ordnance and Logistics Operations Division, Naval Operations (N41)
- Major General Craig Rasmussen, Deputy Chief of Staff (Installations and Logistics), Headquarters Air Force
- Brigadier General Edward Usher Director, Log. Plans, Policy and Strategic Mobility Division, Head Quarters Marine Corps

Technical JCSG

- Dr. Ronald Segal, Director, Defense Research and Engineering

Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG

- Rear Admiral Jan Guadio, Commandant Naval District Washington

Education and Training JCSG

- Mr. Michael Dominguez Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Manpower and Reserve Affairs

Others:

- Dr. Craig College, Deputy Assistant of the Army (I&A)
- Ms. Anne Davis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (IS&A)
- Mr. Phil Grone, Principal Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Installations and Environment)
- Mr. Pete Potochney, Director, OSD BRAC
- Mrs. Nicole Bayert, Associate General Counsel, Environment and Installations, DoD
- Mr. David Steensma, Assistant Deputy Inspector General for Auditing
- Mr. Andrew Porth, Assistant Director, OSD BRAC
- Mr. Michael Aimone, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Basing and Infrastructure
- Commander John Lathroum, Force Integration Branch Officer, Forces Division, J-8
- Colonel Rocky Hills, Office of the Army Chief of Staff for Logistics (G-4)
- Captain Dave England, Joint Staff Logistics



BRAC 2005 JCSG Approach to Military Value

Briefing to the
Infrastructure Steering Group

February 20, 2004



JCSG Military Value Briefing Schedule

■ Schedule for Military Value briefings

- ✓ Feb 17 @ 14:00-15:00 Technical
- ✓ Feb 19 @ 10:00-11:00 Medical
- Feb 20 @ 14:30-15:30 Supply & Storage
- Feb 23 @ 09:00-10:00 Industrial (from Feb 12)
- Feb 23 @ 13:00-14:00 H&SA
- Feb 24 @ 10:00-11:00 Education & Training
- Mar TBD Intelligence
- Apr 2 @ 10:30-11:30 JCSG MV Integration



*Supply and Storage JCSG
Approach to Assessing
Military Value*

Chair: VADM Gordon Holder

Briefing to the
Infrastructure Steering Group
20 February 2004



Overview



- Overall Military Value Approach—Strategy
 - Military Value Summary by Function
- Military Value Scoring Plan Examples
 - Supply
 - Storage
 - Distribution
- Issues Impacting Analysis



Overall Military Value Approach--Strategy



- Driving towards
 - Efficiency
 - Effectiveness
 - Modern IT infrastructure
 - Well-trained and flexible workforce
 - Substantial, multi-modal shipping capacity



Overall Military Value Approach--Strategy



- Considerations
 - Inherent differences in complexity of commodities managed [Chart](#)
 - Impact of recent surge on metrics
 - Scoring multi-modal shipping capabilities



Criteria Weighting



- 35% Criterion 1: Current and Future Capability
- 20% Criterion 2: Availability of land, facilities, and associated airspace
- 35% Criterion 3: Contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements
- 10% Criterion 4: Cost and Manpower Implications



Criteria and Attributes



- Each criterion defined by 3 characteristics relating to Supply and Storage functions
 - Supply
 - Storage
 - Distribution
- 72 Total Questions



JCSG Military Value Summary



		35%	20%	35%	10%
Scoring Plan	# of Attributes	Criteria 1	Criteria 2	Criteria 3	Criteria 4
Supply	10	3	3	2	2*
Storage	9	3	1	3	2*
Distribution	11	2	3	4	2*

* Same attribute used for all 3 functions within criterion 4, actual total of attributes equals 26



Sample of Criteria and Attributes

Criterion 1



- **35%** Criterion 1: Current and Future Capability
 - **40%** Characteristic 1: (SUPPLY) A modern and flexible inventory management process to support and enhance operational readiness
 - **40%** Attribute 1: An effective and efficient requirements determination process
 - **70%** Metric 1: Accommodation Rate
 - » **100%** Question: What was the average accommodation rate for FY 01, 02 and 03? Higher answer = higher score
 - **30%** Metric 2: Demand Satisfaction
 - » **100%** Question: What was the average demand satisfaction rate for requisitions received in FY01, 02, and 03? Higher answer = higher score



Sample of Criteria and Attributes

Criterion 2



- **20%** Criterion 2: Availability of land, facilities, and associated airspace
 - **35%** Characteristic 2: (STORAGE) Operate from modern, efficient, and expandable infrastructure that enhances receipt, storage and issue functions
 - **100%** Attribute 1: Automated material retrieval systems
 - **20%** Metric 1: Utilized capacity in number of retrievals per day
 - » **100%** Question: How many individual items on average did the activity's automated system retrieve per day? Higher answer = higher score



Sample of Criteria and Attributes

Criterion 2 (con't)



- **20%** Criterion 2: Availability of land, facilities, and associated airspace
 - **35%** Characteristic 2: (STORAGE)
 - **100%** Attribute 1:
 - **20%** Metric 2: Ratio of number of items retrieved to number of personnel required to operate the system
 - » **50%** Question: What was the average number of personnel required to operate the system for FY 01, 02 and 03? Scored as a ratio with the next question, higher answer = higher score
 - » **50%** Question: How many individual items on average did the activity's automated system retrieve per day? Scored as a ratio with the preceding question, higher answer = higher score



Sample of Criteria and Attributes

Criterion 2 (con't)



- **20%** Criterion 2: Availability of land, facilities, and associated airspace
 - **35%** Characteristic 2: (STORAGE)
 - **100%** Attribute 1:
 - **60%** Metric 3: Maximum possible retrievals per day
 - » **100%** Question: What was the maximum possible number of retrievals the automated system could make as of 30 September 03? Higher answer = higher score



Sample of Criteria and Attributes

Criterion 3



- **35%** Criterion 3: Contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements
 - **60%** Characteristic 3: (DISTRIBUTION) A modern, flexible distribution system capability with sufficient capacity to adapt to future requirements as defined by personnel, IT, and infrastructure
 - **25%** Attribute 1: A qualified, multi-skilled, sufficient distribution workforce
 - **60%** Metric 1: Qualified personnel
 - » **70%** Question: What is the percent fill of authorized personnel in distribution functions by grade and MOS/series? Higher answer = higher score
 - » **30%** Question: What percent of activity's workforce are qualified for more than one MOS/job series? Higher answer = higher score



Sample of Criteria and Attributes

Criterion 3 (con't)



- **35%** Criterion 3: Contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements
 - **60%** Characteristic 3: (DISTRIBUTION)
 - **25%** Attribute 1:
 - **40%** Metric 2: Available manpower
 - » **30%** Question: How many reserve billets are assigned to your activity as of 30 September 03? Higher answer = higher score
 - » **70%** Question: What was the unemployment rate in the immediate geographic vicinity (50-mile radius) as of 31 May 04? Higher answer = higher score



Analysis of Mil Value Questions



- Quality Assurance Review
 - Questions’ Logic
 - Questions’ “Answerability”
- Scoring
 - Arrayed by weighted value
 - Examine outliers and adjust as appropriate



Issues for ISG



- Shipping activities with multi-modal capabilities
 - Weighting and scoring methodology still being investigated
- Change in S&S JCSG organizational structure
 - Sub-groups and taskings based on commodities
 - Sub-groups now task/mission oriented
 - Will likely shift to a functional orientation (supply, storage, distribution) for data analysis and scenarios